

REMARKS

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 and 8-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikeda US PGPub 2001/003023(hereinafter "Ikeda").

Claims 15 and 23 are cancelled herein.

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, claim 1 recites in part "a passivation layer formed on the source electrode, the drain electrode, and a portion of the semiconductor layer not covered with the source electrode and the drain electrode; and a shielding electrode formed on the passivation layer and disposed on a region between the source electrode and the drain electrode." Referring to FIG. 7 in the present application, in this embodiment of the application, the passivation layer 180 is formed on the source electrode 173 and on the drain electrode 175 and on the portion of the semiconductor layer 154 not covered by the source electrode 173 and the drain electrode 175 and the shielding electrode 196 is formed on the passivation layer 180.

In Ikeda, the Examiner finds the passivation layer of claim 1 by combining the insulation film 7 with the planarization layer 9, and calling the combination "passivation layer (7,9)". It should be noted that the insulation film 7 is not formed on the source electrode 5S and the drain electrode 5D. The Examiner equates the gate electrode 2R in Ikeda FIG. 1 with the "shielding electrode" of claim 1. Applicants respectfully point out that a gate electrode is not "a shielding electrode" as that term is defined in applicant's written description and accordingly the disclosure of Ikeda does not anticipate applicants' invention according to claim 1. Assuming arguendo that gate electrode 2R could be analogous to applicant's "shielding electrode," Ikeda is not applicable. The gate electrode 2R is on top of the insulating film 7 and is not on the "passivation layer (7,9)" Rather the gate electrode 2R is in the interior of the "passivation layer (7,9)" at the interface between the insulation film 7 and the planarization film 9. (Ikeda FIG. 1). In addition, it should be noted that the rear gate electrode 2R is on the same level as the source electrode 5S and the drain electrode 5D.

Applicants believe, based on the above discussion, that claim 1 is allowable and that claims 2-5 dependent from claim 1 are likewise allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 is amended to recite "the first shielding electrode comprises the same layer as the pixel electrode". Ikeda shows, in FIG. 1 and in FIG. 8, cross-sections of thin film transistors wherein a second gate electrode 2R in FIG. 1 and 2F in FIG. 8 is formed in a layer other than the layer in which the pixel electrode is formed. Ikeda does not teach or suggest that the second gate electrode can be formed in the same layer as the pixel electrode.

Based on the amendment to claim 9, applicants believe that claim 9 is allowable and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 9 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding claim 19, claim 19 is amended to recite that "the shielding electrode comprises the same layer as the pixel electrode". As discussed with regard to claim 9, Ikeda does not teach or suggest a shielding electrode comprising the same layer as a pixel electrode.

Applicants believe claim 19 is allowable and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicants believe claim 2-5 dependent from claim 1, claims 10-14 and 16-18 dependent from claim 9 and claims 20- 22 and 24-25 dependent from claim 19 are all allowable for at least the reasons stated with regard to the parent claims 1, 9 and 19, and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (US PGPub 2001/003023) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yanagawa et al. (US PGPub 2001/0038432).

This rejection fails because it relies on the rejection of claim 1 based on the Ikeda reference, a rejection which applicants have shown is not valid.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (US PGPub 2001/003023) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tsubo (US PGPub 2001/0057396).

This rejection fails because it relies on the rejection of claim 1 based on the Ikeda reference, a rejection which applicants have shown is not valid.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance for all claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 392-9250 with any questions regarding the above-identified application.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.

EM 104 157 050 US

Respectfully submitted,

Def W, Held Reg 25,815

[Signature]

Anthony G. Dervan
Patent Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,676